



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MUSONIUS IN CLEMENT

BY CHARLES POMEROY PARKER

A NEW edition of the collected fragments of Musonius is much to be desired. Peerlkamp's text and notes, with Nieuwland's dissertation, are almost impossible to procure. The scattered passages in Stobaeus, Epictetus, etc., fail to produce their true impression, or to attract the attention which they deserve. Meantime, new introductions and notes are needed to show the true relations of the philosopher or philosophers named Musonius to the great Stoic movement of the first and second centuries. But as a first step towards making any such edition, the future editor will have to decide on the question discussed by Wendland, whether a lost treatise of Musonius is to be found in Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus* (*Quaestiones Musonianae. De Musonio Stoico Clementis Alexandrini aliorumque auctore scriptis* Paulus Wendland. Berlin, 1886). The argument of Wendland is interesting, but the real test of it comes in the practical disentangling of the lost treatise from Clement's text. The brief specimen given in the excursus (pp. 63-66) is impressive as far as it goes; but the real problem is not so easy as this specimen would suggest. You cannot simply by leaving out a text from Scripture or a Christian phrase here and there recover a Stoic text. As one contribution to the argument, I will take for analysis the first chapter of the second book of the *Paedagogus* (πῶς περὶ τὰς τροφὰς ἀνυστρεπτέον), because this subject is very fully treated by Musonius as quoted in Stobaeus. All references to Clement are made to the pages and lines of Dindorf's edition, Vol. I, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1869. References to Musonius are made, unless otherwise indicated, to the pages and lines of Otto Hense's edition of the third book of the *Anthology* in Wachsmuth and Hense's Stobaeus, Berlin, 1894.

At first the clearing out of Clementine interpolations proceeds merrily enough; καὶ τὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὸ βιωφελὲς τῆς παιδαγωγίας ἐκλεγόμενοις (211, 5, 6), ἐνταῦθα (212, 17), ἣν ὁ λόγος εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν

παιδαγωγέ (212, 17, 18), — all these come out, as containing allusions to Scripture or to the future life. Section 1 thus becomes possibly a Pagan production if we suppose Clement to have written Χριστιανὸν (211, 7) for σοφὸν (see Wendland, p. 63, Excursus, l. 4), or for σπουδαῖον or ἀγαθὸν (Wendland, p. 64, first note). I might suggest φιλόσοφον or λογικὸν. Turning now to section 2 the text is improved by leaving out the reference to simple truth for simple children (καὶ ἀπερίεργος — παιδίοις, 212, 19-21); for this contains allusion to the word παιδαγωγός and hinders the argument on food. Section 2 is all right now, and 3 needs no emendation to make a Stoic text. But when we come to section 4 the trouble begins. Starting from the idea of luxurious feasts, Clement attacks the conduct of the ἀγάπη or Christian love-feast, which must have become far from religious in his time; 215, 1-18 (ὃν ἀγάπην — πολλούς) comes out at once, and there are several texts of Scripture on page 214. If we add to these the reference to seeking heavenly bread, there is nothing left of section 4 except the first five lines. Section 5 contains certainly some quotations from Musonius, and may have been written by him, until we come to 216, 7, when the discussion of the ἀγάπη begins again; and we cannot possibly attribute anything to Musonius after that until the middle of section 7 (217, 12). Here, however, begins a clearly Stoic passage. Awkwardly enough, to be sure, appears as an essential part of this passage the word ἀγάπη, but if we are determined that Clement cannot have written good literary passages of Stoicism we may easily suppose that he changed the word ἀρετή of his author to ἀγάπη. An excellent sense is secured by restoring ἀρετή. With the rest of section 7 I will not meddle for the present. In 8 Clement introduces a new problem, περὶ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, and continues on this for several pages. Numerous quotations are made from the Apostle Paul, and the discussion is conducted on the principles which Paul lays down to the Corinthians and the Romans; but all this argument seems to be concerned in Clement's mind with the question of eating the flesh of animals; and there are not a few traces of a Stoic or Pythagorean writer strangely mixed in with the Scripture, and not well adjusted thereto in every respect. The first glimpse of this author is 218, 21-23, where occurs the implied suggestion that those who love the bloody feasts are like the ghosts of Homer's *Odyssey* gathering to

drink the blood. A few words from line 25 are needed to complete this passage. Then 219, 9 is Stoic and (if we except ἀρα) will come in well here. At 219, 15 begins a passage of eleven lines which is Stoic (or Pythagorean perhaps) except for two Scripture references, and the reading of πατρός (219, 20) for which we had better substitute θεοῦ as a restoration of the probable Musonian word. Then omitting a reference to ἀγάπη and to feeding upon Christ we secure ten or eleven lines of our Greek philosopher. At 220, 10 begins the Christian Apostle again; but 220, 15-21 is (most of it) the philosopher, if we make the proper change for Χριστιανῶ as above. Then after a whole page of Clement and the Apostle, comes our Stoic clearly again; and after omitting 222, 1, 2 (ὑπηχῆσαι — λέγουσα) we need not yet interfere with the rest of 222. But 223, 2-16 is too full of the Apostle to retain. By this time we are fairly through the question of eating flesh, and launched on the question of decent behaviour at meals and avoidance of expense. These subjects are continued 223, 17 — 224, 3. After this, however, the discussion about fishes and the Apostle Peter, etc., gives us no help in our restoration until we come to 225, 2-10. But at οὐδὲ περιπαταί ποτε in line 10 the influence of Matthew's gospel becomes evident, and we cannot continue to find our traces of the philosopher until line 19. The rest of the page is easily Stoic and part of it at least is Musonius. 226, 6-17 are lines in part of Musonius, but contain a peculiar problem of their own which we will reserve. The remaining three sections of the chapter have in them much about the New and Old Testaments. In 227, 9-13 is a reference to the Peripatetic doctrine of the mean which does not assort itself well with a Stoic. In 228, 12-19 comes a quotation from Plato's *Epistles* which is connected with a passage about King David. In 229, 2-7 is an allegorical reference to a fish described and named by Aristotle and Epicharmus. This I have found it hard to fit on to our supposed Musonian fragments. But there is a passage about pleasure and nourishment (228, 2-9), which can find a place there.

Looking back now over the Clementine fragments separated from his Stoic authority we find that we cannot deny to the Alexandrian teacher the possession of some ideas of his own. We have been unable to take the Christian passages out of the text without allowing to go with them several suggestions of mystical philosophy. See 216, 16-19,

where love for God and our neighbor is ἡ ἐπουράνιος εὐχία, contrasted with ἡ ἐπίγειος. Compare (214, 20) ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς θηρωμένοις τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἐπουράνιον. Here, again, the heavenly food is contrasted with the perishable food of the belly. This sort of contrast can be easily paralleled from the New Testament, and the word ἐπουράνιος is found there in some of these parallel passages. A man who diligently studied the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, for instance, would easily learn to make such mystical speculations as these. In the sixth chapter of the Fourth Gospel is an instance just like this, though the word ἐπουράνιος does not occur there. Clement dwells on the same idea in 216, 24-26, where he refers to our ordinary food as τὸ ἐφήμερον ἄριστον in contrast with τὸ ἄριστον τῶν ὄντων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. The word ἐφήμερος occurs once in the New Testament in a wholly unmystical passage (*James* 2, 15). The phrase τὸ ἄριστον τῶν ὄντων has quite a Platonic sound to it. The whole passage shows that Clement could step for himself at least a little way in mysticism without a direct quotation from the New Testament. For continuing (217, 3-7) he refers to ἀγάπη as χρῆμα καθαρὸν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄξιον. And of the earthly love feasts he says ἔναυσμά τι ἀγάπης ἔχουσι ἐκ τῆς πανδημον τροφῆς συνεπιζόμενον εἰς αἰδὶον τροφήν.¹ This last passage is quite Platonic. The use of καθαρὸν just above in its mystical meaning cannot be paralleled in the New Testament. I conclude, then, that the undoubted Clementine passages show traces of mysticism.

Now there are in the philosophic parts of the chapter several mystical passages hitherto passed over in this discussion, which ill accord with the known attitude of the Stobaeian Musonius. You can find in him of course the distinction of seeming and being, and the idea of secure and abiding joy (χαρὰν βεβύαιαν—Peerlkamp, 173, line 10). But he seems to me not to show any such mystical feeling as is seen in Clement (219, 22-25) ἀγαστὸν μὲν οὖν πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ἀναθρήσαντας τῆς αἰῶν τροφῆς ἐξέχουσιν τῆς θείας καὶ τῆς τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἀπληρώτου ἐμπύμπλασθαι θείας, τῆς βεβυίου καὶ μονίμου καὶ καθαρᾶς γενομένης ἡδονῆς. This passage, I think, could not be printed in an edition of Musonius; and the reference to burying τὸ ἀγαθὸν in the gluttonous

¹ I write τροφήν for τρυφήν of the MSS. Their reading makes no sense. There is an erasure in the Paris MS. in which υ is written.

life might be omitted with it. If Clement could not have written these things (a question which I leave to experts in his writings), then he must have made use of some mystical philosopher who was not Musonius. Another mystical passage of a Platonic or Pythagorean character is that in 212, 8-12. τὸ δὲ ἴδιον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ὄμμα τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκκαθαίρειν, ἀγνίζειν δὲ καὶ τὴν σάρκα αὐτῆς. ὁ γὰρ ἐκείνων καθαρῶς ἀπολυθεὶς, δι' ὧν ἔτι χοῦς ἐστίν, τί ἂν ἄλλο προουργαίτερον ἑαυτοῦ ἔχοι πρὸς τὸ ὀδῶ ἔλθειν ἐπὶ τὴν κατάληψιν τοῦ θεοῦ; I might parallel this passage in part from Persius or Seneca; but I have been in the habit of considering such passages in them as traces of Platonism or Pythagoreanism or some oriental influence. They seem wholly out of harmony with the every day thought of Musonius in Stobaeus, or of Rufus the teacher of Epictetus. There remains (226, 10-17) a most curious passage about the *δαίμων* who dwells in the belly of the greedy man. This probably has some relation to a quasi Platonic doctrine of *δαίμονες*, or to some peculiar Alexandrian development. It might have appeared, perhaps, in some Pythagorean of Alexandria; but whether it is Clement's own writing or not, it implies a line of thought wholly unfamiliar to Musonius as we know him.

But now when our mystical passages have been disposed of, throwing away with them perhaps 218, 7, 8 (τὸν ἐφήμερον διώκοντες βίον ὡς οὐ ζησόμενοι) 220, 20-21 (καταφρονοῦντες τῶν ὀψων, ὡς μετ' ὀλίγον οὐκ ὄντων), possibly even 225, 7-10 (καὶ ἰσχὺν—ἀναγκαῖα) surely one may say that we have a good Stoic remainder. Perhaps so, but I am greatly impressed with a peculiar rhetorical quality in three of the remaining passages. The Stobaeian Musonius is so simple and natural and healthy in his discussions that one may be permitted some surprise at seeing him burst out into declamations which remind one of Seneca. Take the description of kinds of food from all parts of the earth, and the denunciation of the life among the sizzling frying pans (in 213, 8—214, 16), ending with the description of the man who searches out suppers of sweetmeats and is himself nothing but a jaw. Musonius does say (Stobaeus 528, 1, 2) παρασκευῇ μὲν ὀψων γίνεται μυρίων· πλείται δ' ἢ θάλαττα μέχρι περάτων. But I cannot help thinking that Clement, who evidently at least knew and pondered Musonius, has enlarged rhetorically on the brief text given above. Another passage is the vivid description of gluttons at the

feast in Clement 222, 3-4. This has usually been supposed to be a description of Alexandrian performances about A.D. 200. If Wendland is right we must transfer them to the first century, and perhaps to Rome. There are certainly traces of Musonius in this passage. Compare Clement 222, 15 *seq.* with Stobaeus 524, 10 *seq.* But here, again, I would suggest that the passage reads like an illustration from (say Alexandrian) life made on the text of Musonius by an able rhetorician. And it may be remarked that the general impression made by Clement's *Paedagogus*, compared with the Stobaean Musonius, is of one who takes an interest in describing evil as a warning, compared with one who delights in describing good as an attraction. This seems to me very marked in the treatment of marriage and kindred topics. The beautiful descriptions of family life in Musonius are much more Christian than is the vivid consciousness of evil possessed by the Alexandrian. The rhetorical descriptions of wrong doing are hardly likely to have been written by Musonius. Besides these, there is one more rhetorical passage 217, 21 — 218, 8. It is a passage of denunciation, and contains at least one clause which seems to have reference to the devil as a snake, ἐπὶ γαστέρας ἔρποντες, θηρία ἀνδρείκελα κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν τοῦ λίχνου θηρίου. I am inclined to refer the whole to Clement.

But now we have done our worst in tearing away passages from the *Paedagogus*. Our suggestion that the author of these passages was a mystical theorist and rhetorician, earnest in his denunciation of evil, has been clearly made. There remains, however, a large body of text which holds together pretty well when thus purged, and which may have been written by some Stoic author. It certainly contains passages just like the Stobaean Musonius. These are clearly shown in Wendland's discussion, especially on pages 24-27. The chapter as a whole is differently arranged from the Stobaean dialogues (503 *seq.* and 523 *seq.*), and they contain passages not in Clement's Stoic author, just as he has passages not in them. But all this is natural if Musonius wrote a book, and afterwards talked to a friend or pupil as reported in the Stobaean dialogue. If the rest of a Stoic treatise can be extracted from Clement with the amount of success we have attained (not to speak of the marked success of the passage in Wendland's excursus) then such a treatise might well be printed,

though doubtfully, in the same book with Musonius, and might serve at least to show the relation of Stoic philosophy to various forms of Alexandrian thought (Platonic, Pythagorean, Oriental, or so-called Christian). Our experiment goes far to support Wendland's theory that a treatise of Musonius is hidden in the *Paedagogus*; but the process of disentangling the text seems to be more complicated than Wendland found it. I commend as a suggestion to the future editor of such a volume the following text which results from our criticism. Particles and conjunctions which seem to have been inserted by Clement in piecing out his text I have bracketed. Notes are given on other bracketed words. In piecing out this text I have omitted Clement 215, 19-23 not because of any difficulty in attributing the words themselves to Musonius, but because they seem to belong to the Clementine previous context, and we get a better connection of Musonian thought without them.

CONJECTURAL RESTORATION OF MUSONIUS OUT OF CLEMENT'S

Paedagogus, II, 1

Ἐχομένοις τοίνυν τοῦ σκοποῦ, ὁποῖόν τινα εἶναι χρὴ παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον τὸν [φιλόσοφον]¹ καλούμενον, κεφαλαιωδῶς ὑπογράφτεον. ἀρκτέον οὖν ἡμῖν ἀφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ὅπως ἀρμόττειν γε χρὴ. στοχαζομένοις τοίνυν τῆς συμμετρίας τοῦ συντάγματος, ὁποῖόν τινα τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σώματι ἕκαστον ἡμῶν προσφέρεισθαι, μᾶλλον δὲ ὅπως αὐτὸ κατευθύνειν χρὴ λεκτέον. ὁπότεν γάρ τις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκτὸς καὶ αὐτῆς ἔτι τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀγωγῆς ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀχθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου τὴν θεωρίαν τῶν κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον συμβαινόντων κατὰ φύσιν ἀκριβῶς ἐκμάθῃ, εἴσεται μὴ σπουδάζειν [μὲν] περὶ τὰ ἐκτός. οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι ζῶσιν ἵνα ἐσθίωσιν, ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα, οἷς οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ γαστήρ ἐστιν ὁ βίος, ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ [λόγος]² ἐσθίειν παραγγέλλει, ἵνα ζῶμεν. οὔτε γὰρ ἔργον ἡμῖν ἢ τροφή οὔτε σκοπὸς ἡδονή, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς διαμονῆς. διὸ καὶ ἐκκρίνεται ἡ τροφή. ἀπλῇ δὲ αὕτη, ὥσάν εἰς τὸ ζῆν, οὐκ εἰς τρυφήν ἐπιτήδειος. τὸ δὲ ἐκ δυοῖν τὸ ζῆν τοῦτο ὑγιείας τε καὶ ἰσχύος σύγκειται, οἷς μάλιστα κατάλληλον τῆς τροφῆς τὸ εὐκόλον, εἷς τε τὰς

¹ In Clement *Χριστιανόν*. We have quoted and suggested various other readings on a previous page.

² In Clement *παιδαγωγός*. But this is equivalent to *λόγος* in his treatise.

ἀναδόσεις καὶ τοῦ σώματος τὴν κουφότητα χρησιμεῖον, ἐξ ὧν αὐξησίς τε καὶ ὑγίεια καὶ ἰσχύς δικαία, οὐχὶ δὲ ἀδικος ἢ σφάλερὰ καὶ ἀθλία ὡς ἢ τῶν ἀθλητῶν ἐξ ἀναγκοφαγίας περιγίνεται. αἱ μὲν οὖν πολυειδεῖς ποιότητες ἀποπτυσταί, ποικίλας ἐντίκτουσαι βλάβας, καχεξίας σωμάτων, ἀνατροπὰς στομάχων, ἐκπορνεύσεως τῆς γένεως διὰ τινος κακοδαίμονος τέχνης τῆς ὀψαρτυτικῆς καὶ τῆς ἀμφὶ τὰ πέμματα ματαιοτεχνίας. τροφήν γὰρ τολμῶσιν καλεῖν τὴν ἐν τρυφαίς ἐπιτήδευσιν εἰς ἡδονὰς ἐπιβλαβεῖς ὀλισθάνουσιν. Ἀντιφάνης δὲ ὁ Δῆλιος ἱατρὸς καὶ μίαν τῶν νόσου αἰτιῶν ταύτην εἴρηκεν τῶν ἐδεσμάτων τὴν πολυειδίαν—οὐ γὰρ μεμαθήκασι τὸν θεὸν παρυσκενάσαι [τῷ δημιουργήματι]¹ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ [λέγω] σῖτα καὶ ποτὰ τοῦ σώζεσθαι χάριν, οὐχὶ δὲ τοῦ ἡδεσθαι, ἐπεὶ μὴδὲ ὠφελείσθαι πέφυκεν τὰ σώματα ἐκ τῆς πολυτελείας τῶν βρωμάτων. πᾶν γὰρ τοῖναντίον οἱ ταῖς εὐτελεστάταις χρώμενοι τροφαῖς ἰσχυρότατοί εἰσιν καὶ ὑγιεινότατοι καὶ γενναιότατοι, ὡς οἰκείται δεσποτῶν καὶ γεωργοὶ κτητόρων. καὶ οὐ μόνον βωμαλεώτεροι, ἀλλὰ καὶ φρονιμώτεροι, ὡς φιλόσοφοι πλουσίων. οὐ γὰρ ἐπέχωσαν τὸν νοῦν ταῖς τροφαῖς οὐδὲ ἠπάτησαν αὐτὸν ἡδοναῖς. ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὸ δεῖπνον ἔστω λιτὸν ἡμῖν καὶ εὐζωνον, ἐπιτήδειον εἰς ἐργήγορσιν, ποικίλαις ἀνεπίμικτον ποιότησιν, οἷα [ἀπαιδαγωγῆτον]² οὐδὲ τοῦτο. ἀγαθὴ γὰρ κουροτρόφος εἰς κοινωνίων [ἀρετῇ]³ ἐφόδιον ἔχουσα πλούσιον, τὴν αὐτάρκειαν, ἣ δὲ ἐφεστῶσα τῇ τροφῇ, δικαίᾳ ποσότητι μεμετρημένη, σωτηρίως τὸ σῶμα διοικοῦσα καὶ τοῖς πλησίον ἀπένειμειν τι ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἣ δὲ ὑπερβλύζουσα τὴν αὐτάρκειαν δαίτα τὸν ἄνθρωπον κακοῖ, νωθῇ μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἐπισφαλὲς δὲ εἰς νόσον ἐργαζομένη τὸ σῶμα. μισρὰ δοκεῖ μοι καὶ βδελυρὰ ἐκείνα, ὧν ἐφίπτανται τοῖς αἵμασι

ψυχαὶ ὑπὲξ ἐρέβους νεκρῶν κατατεθνηώτων.

ἐπεὶ δὶχα σωζομένων καὶ φθιμένων τροφαί. ἀδιάφορος [ἄρα] ἡ φυσικὴ χρῆσις τῆς τροφῆς. ἀλλὰ κρατοῦντες δηλονότι τῶν ἡδονῶν κωλύομεν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας. οὐ χρὴ οὖν καθάπερ ἀσωτευομένους ἡμᾶς παραχρησθαι

¹ I suspect this word is inserted by Clement. It does not seem to be a Musonian word. Compare the parallel passage in Stobaeus 527, 7-9. This omission carries with it the following λέγω.

² No reference to the παιδαγωγός seems likely in Musonius. Perhaps we should read *διλογον*.

³ In Clement *ἀγάπη*. But this obviously cannot stand in a Stoic passage. We have spoken of the change to *ἀρετή* earlier in our discussion.

τοῖς τοῦ [θεοῦ]¹ δωρήμασι, χρῆσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς ὡς ἄρχοντας ἀπροσκλη-
νῶς· καὶ γὰρ βασιλεύειν ἐτάχθημεν καὶ κατακυριεύειν, οὐχὶ δουλεύειν
τοῖς βρώμασιν. κομιδῇ δὲ ἄλογον καὶ ἀχρεῖον καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπειον βου-
μαίων δίκην πωινομένους θανάτῳ τρέφεσθαι, κάτω βλέποντας εἰς γῆν,
τοὺς ἐκ γῆς αἰεὶ κεκυφύτας εἰς τραπέζας, τὴν λίχνον διωκαθόντας ζῶν,
μόνην καλακεύοντας τὴν κατὰ ποσιν, δι' ἣν πολυτιμότεροι γεγονάσι μάγι-
ροι γεωργῶν. οὐκ ἀφεκτίον [οὖν] παντελῶς τῶν ποικίλων βρωμάτων,
ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ αὐτὰ σπουδαστίον. μεταληπτίον δὲ τῶν παρατιθεμένων, ὡς
πρέπον [φιλοσόφῳ],² τιμῶντας μὲν τὸν κεκληγότα κατὰ τὴν ἀβλαβῆ
καὶ ἀπροσκορῆ τῆς συνουσίας κοινωνίαν, ἀδιάφορον δὲ ἡγουμένους τῶν
εἰσκομιζομένων τὴν πολυτέλειαν. θηρίων [γὰρ] μᾶλλον [τοῦτο γέ]³ καὶ
ἢ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀναθυμιάσις θολοδεστέρα οὕσα ἐπισκοτεῖ τῇ ψυχῇ. εἰ δέ
τις καὶ τούτων μεταλαμβάνει, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει, μόνον ἐγκρατῶς μετεχέτω,
μὴ ἐξεχόμενος μηδὲ ἀπρητημένος αὐτῶν μηδὲ ἐπιλαιμαργῶν τῷ ὄψῳ. ἔστι
γὰρ ὁρᾶν τοὺς τοιούτους ἴσιν ἢ κυσὶν διὰ τὴν λαβρότητα μᾶλλον ἢ
ἀνθρώποις ὡμοιωμένους. ἡ γοῦν ὀψοφαγία οὐδὲν ἑτερόν ἐστιν ἢ ἀμετρία
περὶ χρῆσιν ὄψου, καὶ ἡ λαιμαργία μανία περὶ τὸν λαιμὸν καὶ ἡ γαστρι-
μαργία ἀκρασία περὶ τὴν τροφήν, ὡς δὲ καὶ τοῦνομα περιέχει, μανία ἐπὶ
γαστέρα, ἐπὶ μάργος ὁ μεμηνώς. ἀφεκτίον οὖν δουλοπρεπείας ἀπάσης
καὶ ἀκρασίας τῶν παρατιθεμένων κοσμῶς ἐφαπτομένοις, ἀμόλυντον καὶ
τὴν χεῖρα καὶ τὴν στρωμνὴν καὶ τὸ γένειον φυλάττουσιν, τὸ εὐσχημον
τοῦ προσώπου διατηροῦσιν ἀδιάστροφον, οὐκ ἀσχημονοῦσιν οὐδὲ περὶ τὴν
κατὰ ποσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν χεῖρα μετὰ τάξεως ἐκ διωστημάτων ἐκτατίον,
παραφυλακτίον δὲ καὶ τὸ φθέγγεσθαι ὁτιοῦν ἐσθίοντα ἄμα. ἀπρεπὴς
γὰρ καὶ ἄσημος ἡ φωνὴ γίνεται, πλήρεσι ταῖς γνάθοις στενοχωρουμένη.
καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα τῇ τροφῇ πιεζομένη, τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐνεργείας παραπο-
δισθείσα τὴν προφορὰν ἐκδίδωσι τεθλιμμένην. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐσθίειν ἄμα καὶ
πίνειν καθήκει. ἀκρασίας γὰρ τῆς μεγίστης συγχεῖν τοὺς καιροὺς, ὧν αἱ
χρήσεις ἀσύμφωνοι. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἔνεκεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐγέ-
νετο τὰ πάντα, ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶσι χρῆσθαι καλόν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αἰεὶ. καὶ γὰρ
καὶ ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ὁ χρόνος καὶ ὁ τρόπος καὶ τὸ πρὸς τί οὐκ ὀλίγην τῷ

¹ In Clement πατρός, but this seems unlikely in a Pagan writer.

² In Clement Χριστιανῷ.

³ The neuter pronoun and the γὰρ do not work well here; I suspect that there is a hitch in restoring the Musonian text at this point; but this sentence is certainly Musonian.

[παιδαγωγούμενῳ]¹ πρὸς τὸ λυσιτελεῖς ἐνδίδωσι ῥοπήν, καὶ τό γε ἔστι ἐπιτήδειον. πολυτέλεια δὲ οὐκ εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἔρημον, ἀλλ' εἰς μετάδοσιν κοινωνικὴν ἐπιτήδειος. διὸ παραφυλακτέον τῶν βρωμάτων ἃ μὴ πεινῶντας ἡμᾶς ἰσθίειν ἀναπείθει γοητεύοντα τὰς δρέξεις. μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστι καὶ ἐν εὐτελείᾳ σῶφρονι πολυειδία ἐδεσμάτων ὑγιεινῇ; βολβοὶ, ἐλαῖαι, λαχάνων ἕνια, γάλα, τυρὸς, τὰ τε ὠραῖα ἐψήματά τε παντοδύπῃ ζωμῶν ἀνευ. κἂν ὁπτοῦ δέῃ κρέως ἢ ἐφθοῦ, μεταδοτέον. πρὸς τοῦτοις οὐδὲ τραγημάτων καὶ κηρίων ἀμοίρους περιορατέον τοὺς δειπνοῦντας κατὰ λόγον. τῶν γὰρ τοι βρωμάτων ἐπιτηδεύοτατα οἷς αὐτόθεν χρῆσθαι ὑπάρχει δίχα πυρὸς, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐτοιμότερα, δεύτερα δὲ τὰ εὐτελέστερα, ὡς προειρήκαμεν. ἀνθρώποις δὲ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ βλάβην καὶ λύπην ἐνεγέννησεν ἡδονή, δυσπάθειαν δὲ καὶ λήθην καὶ ἀφροσύνην ἢ πολυτροφία ἐντίκτει τῇ ψυχῇ. εὐανξῇ δὲ καὶ τῶν παιδῶν τὰ σώματα γίνεσθαι φυσικῶς εἰς μῆκος ἐπιιδιόντων ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλλειπούσης τροφῆς. οὐ γὰρ κωλύεται τὸ ἀνατρέχον εἰς αὔξησιν πνεῦμα τῆς πολλῆς τροφῆς ἀντιφραττούσης τὸ εὐπνουν τοῦ δρόμου.

If the reasoning which we have followed, and the text which we have obtained, commend themselves to any scholar, then the following rules may be laid down for rescuing the rest of our Stoic's text from the *Pædagogus* II and III. The problem of Book I is harder. First, leave out references to Scripture, to Christian doctrines, and to Christian customs. Second, take away all traces of mystical speculation. Third, omit all rhetorical descriptions of wickedness. Fourth, leave out references to Peripatetic doctrines. Wendland gives only the first of these rules, and in suggesting this does not warn us of that close entanglement of Christian and Pagan thought which we have actually found in this chapter. But all who are interested in Stoicism owe much to him for his ingenious and stimulating dissertation.

¹ Probably φιλοσόφῳ or some such word was in the Musonian text.